

Date: Wed, 07 Jul 2004 10:13:36 -0400

To: Stephen.M.Schmidt.1@gsfc.nasa.gov, Dave Thompson
<David.J.Thompson@nasa.gov>, Robert.C.Hartman@nasa.gov, kdahya@swales.com,
James.P.Loughlin@nasa.gov, Michael.J.Viens@nasa.gov,
Charles.C.He.1@gsfc.nasa.gov, walter thomas <Walter.B.Thomas@nasa.gov>, Henning
Leidecker <Henning.W.Leidecker@nasa.gov>
From: Michael Amato <michael.amato@nasa.gov>
Subject: Riddle me this - and dont forget about today at 4 pm, bring any new information
Cc: James Odom <james.l.odom@nasa.gov>, Lee Niemeyer
<Lee.Niemeyer@nasa.gov>, Liqin.L.Wang.1@gsfc.nasa.gov,
Ryan.A.Simmons@nasa.gov, Glenn Unger <Glenn.L.Unger@nasa.gov>

Riddle me this:

How is it we ;

- Reduced the stresses by an order of magnitude.
- Reviewed and tweaked the analysis showing that reduction at least two times using other analysts.
- Removed from the potting process any variables we thought could change the stress from the nominal cases (centering, Mu metal variances, potting control etc)
- **Qualified 9 of the new design from +45C to -40C and tested some to -60C, with no failures**
- Ran our work through a review to look for problems

And with the latest tests see the same failure rate as before but over less of a temperature range (at lower stress), at least two of the 4 failures coming on the first cycle.

We will find something, just a oversimplified summary of our frustration.

By the way a question to ponder this afternoon. The question keeps coming up, is there a way to cycle the PMTs after potting and have any faith or be able to say anything intelligent about the future failure rate of PMTs that make it through say 4 initial cycles (the partial life test we will restart might tell us something eventually but I dont think the number of PMTs is high enough)

Michael Amato